

## **Regional Bicycle Working Group**

August 16, 2007 Meeting Notes

Meeting called to order at 1:07pm.

### **1. Introductions**

### **2. Summary of June meeting**

No comments on the June meeting minutes.

### **3. Regional Bicycle Plan Status**

- Victoria Eisen (Eisen & Letunic, MTC Bike Plan consultant) reiterated that the scope of the bike plan is an update, not a major revision. However, the scope has been modified reflecting RBWG comments to date. If group members have additional comments on the scope, please email Victoria and Sean Co.
- Three sections of the final draft plan (financially constrained network, goals and policies) must be ready for RBWG review at the December 2007 meeting so that the MTC Planning Committee can use the information to inform development of the RTP. Rochelle Wheeler (ACTIA) noted that since the RBWG had previously indicated that it was the other chapters that needed updating, that it could be possible (and would be beneficial) to extend the review period for the other chapters, which don't require MTC Planning Committee review.
- Dave Campbell (EBBC) asked about the strategy for CEQA clearance of the plan. Because MTC is not the agency implementing the projects, there is no need to include the bike plan update in the RTP and further, inclusion may subject the plan to unwanted scrutiny. The group suggested that MTC staff seek internal legal opinions on the best strategy for CEQA review.
- Victoria noted that the project list from the 2001 plan (which was updated by Doug Johnson, MTC, in 2004) had significant inconsistencies, mostly related to project boundaries and estimated facility costs.
- The MTC maintains two bike facility databases: (1) used for the bike plan; (2) used for BikeMapper. The goal is to integrate the two, yet this will not happen in time to inform the bike plan update.
- Short term goal: update the 2004 data using information provided by the CMAs (which varies in quality). Victoria anticipates that facility mileage and end points will be easy to tighten up; facility costs will be more difficult as the bases for cost estimates vary: some are taken from actual engineering estimates, other are based on a per-mile cost by facility type, escalated from the 2001 estimates.
- Long term goal: secure MTC GIS staff resources to integrate the two databases.
- The group discussed criteria for selecting projects for inclusion in the network. It was unclear what criteria were used in 2001. It was recommended that the plan identify the need to revisit project selection criteria. It would be a good opportunity to incorporate new policies such as Safe Routes to Transit. It was noted that often corridors are given priority when the streets directly adjacent to transit hubs aren't being quantified/reflected in the plan.

### **4. TALC's Bicycle and Pedestrian RTP Platform**

TALC intends to release their RTP platform in October in time for the joint ABAG MTC RTP meeting. In addition to the platform bullets listed in the agenda, Andy Thornley (SFBC) suggested that the need for full-time bike staff for MTC be added. Dave asked whether the RBWG could endorse the TALC platform, or portion thereof. It was noted that included TALC's priorities in the BMP update could give TALC's platform more authority. Yet, since the current BMP revision is only a small update, this creates a "chicken-before-the-egg" conflict: how can MTC be asked to fully fund the bike network, when the network isn't being updated?

Rochelle suggested that combining bike and ped as one line item in the RTP tends to give each less weight and suggested that they be listed as separate items. Sean noted that they are difficult to separate out. New routine accommodation policies that would dictate bike/ped accommodation around freeway interchanges, for example, would further complicate this separation, noted Brad Beck.

#### **5. Electronic bicycle locker reservation system**

Does the ability to reserve eLockers conflict with the goal of maximizing use of lockers and making them available to the greatest number of people? Jennifer Stanley (City of Oakland) suggested that the group invite Steven Grover (eLock Technologies) to explain the capabilities of the reservation system for his company's lockers. Laura Timothy (BART) said that though Grover's system can accommodate reservations in theory, in practice, it's not yet up and running, nor has it been tested. Celia [last name?] (Caltrain) described Caltrain's plan to use a combination of shared and assigned lockers and noted that each facility owner should be able to set policy for rentals, cost, reservations, etc., based on each site's need, rather than having a regional one-size-fits-all model. However, the group agreed that for card-key lockers, the best model would be for one card to work for all lockers in the region, if feasible.

There was interest in starting a regional bike locker working group. Jennifer suggested that the group wait until BART had awarded their contract to begin devising any regional policy. The group agreed that this issue should be placed on the RBWG October agenda.

#### **6. BikeMapper Demo**

The demo of this "second generation" BikeMapper (aka BikeMapper 2) wasn't available. Andy explained that the upgrade was developed for San Francisco as a joint project between the MTC GIS team and the SFBC, and funded by a grant (source unknown). It provides "turn-by-turn" functionality like MapQuest. MTC plans to extend this functionality to other counties, but there are no funds to do so. It was suggested that if cost estimates for each county were generated, then each county might be able to help fund the upgrade; work could potentially be integrated with the effort to combine the two MTC bike facility databases.

#### **7. Routine Accommodation Checklist Demo**

Sean walked the group through the new online form. Beginning fall 2007, applicants for roads rehab funding will be required to complete the checklist. Once the forms are completed, the resulting information is available to the public. This will facilitate BPAC review of proposed projects. Rochelle suggested that a link to the RA Guidance document be placed on the online form; the group agreed and further suggested that helpful pop-ups be included in the interface as needed. The next call for CMAQ funded projects is expected to be announced in January 2008, with CMAs responding in March. The CMAs will require project sponsors to complete the online form, schedule not yet determined.

#### **8. Other Items**

No new items/announcements were added to those on the agenda. For the MTC/ABAG Fall forum, an RSVP is recommended.

Respectfully submitted,

Jennifer Stanley  
City of Oakland, Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities Coordinator